REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed November 28, 2007 has been carefully considered. In the Office Action, Claims 1-18 and 22-25 are pending and all claims have been rejected. Claims 1, 22, and 23 have been amended with the filing of this response and Applicants respectfully submit that the modification to the claims is supported by the originally filed application. Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-18 and 22-25 is hereby requested in view of the amendment of Claims 1, 22, and 23 and the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 1-18 and 22-25 were rejected to under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written requirement, for the use of claim language directed at 'threads.' While Applicant believes support exists in the specification for these amendments, it was determined that a different amendment to the claims would better serve the claims of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims to remove the term 'threads', and it is therefore requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8, 11, 13-18 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,901,554 to Bahrs et al. ("Bahrs") in view of "What are Enterprise JavaBeans components?..." [hereinafter Norby].

Norby:

Norby describes an overview of Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB) technology, enabling readers

to gain a quick understanding of essential concepts.

Bahrs:

Bahrs is directed at an architectural pattern for creating applications for a data processing

systemA graphical user interface is created in which the graphical user interface includes a

plurality of components. Processes for presenting the plurality of components and receiving user

input are handled by a first set of graphical objects, wherein in response to selected user input, a

first event is generated. . (Col. 2, lines 55-56).

In particular, Bahrs describes ViewControllers and Application Mediators. At column

15, lines 56-60, Bahrs states:

"…Architectural pattern 500 includes a ViewController 502, which provides a display of
a component, container or bean on a data processing system. ViewController 502 basically
provides a reusable GUI element containing graphical components such as text fields, labels,
buttons, tables, images, beans, etc. to be displayed for viewing and interacting by a user…."

At columns 30-35, Bahrs describes steps in building an application using the JTC

architecture, and states that 'The key to the successful implementation of a JTC application that

has reusable and maintainable parts is the proper division of the application into logical

subsystems. *This division should be driven by the analysis of the application's domain*. For

example, using an object oriented analysis of the application's domain, sets of use cases can be

developed…"

It is clear through the examples that are given throughout Bahr, that Bahr focuses on

providing different ViewControllers based on *application domain* specific information.

With regard to Norby, the Examiner appears to rely on Norby as teaching that an application can be developed once, and deployed numerous times.

In contrast, the independent claims, as amended, are clearly drawn to a method, system and apparatus whereby an *application user interface* is adapted for use by different clients having different display capabilities. A clear advantage of such a system is that allows the application and interface to be developed once and deployed for use by multiple different types of client devices. No such advantage is suggested or taught by Bahrs, Norby or the combination thereof. For at least this reason the independent claims are patentably distinct over the references, and it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bahrs in view of Nordby and further in view of Rennard (U.S. patent 6, 615,131).

Rennard:

Rennard describes an enhanced operating environment that improves input and output techniques in a navigation system by reducing the number of inputs to a navigational sytstem through a wireless device. Although Rennard does discuss wireless communication, it fails to overcome the inadequacies of the combination of Bahrs and Norby with regard to the claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants' believe that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (508) 293-6275.

Please charge all fees occasioned by this submission to Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____1/25/2008_____   __/Lindsay G. McGuinness/_____
                                       Lindsay G. McGuinness. (Reg. No. 38,549)
                                       Attorney for Applicants
                                       EMC Corporation
                                       Office of General Counsel
                                       176 South Street
                                       Hopkinton, MA 01748
                                       Telephone: (508) 293-6985
                                       Facsimile: (508) 293-7189